arXiv:1607.03291v2 [math.LO] 16 Jul 2016

FREE SETS FOR SET-MAPPINGS RELATIVE TO A FAMILY OF SETS

ANTONIO AVILÉS AND CLARIBET PIÑA

ABSTRACT. Given a family $\mathcal{F}$ of subsets of $\{1,\dots,m\}$, we try to compute the least natural number n such that for every function $S:[\aleph_n]^{<\omega}\longrightarrow[\aleph_n]^{<\omega}$ there exists a bijection $u:\{1,\dots,m\}\longrightarrow Y\subset\aleph_n$ such that $Su(A)\cap Y\subset u(A)$ for all $A\in\mathcal{F}$.

1. INTRODUCTION

For a set X, $[X]^{<\omega}$ denotes the family of all finite subsets of X, and, for a cardinal n, $[X]^n$ denotes the family of all subsets of X of cardinality n. The following is a variant of a classical result of Kuratowski and Sierpiński [6]:

Theorem 1.1. *For a set X and a natural number n the following are equivalent:*

(1) $|X|\leq\aleph_{n-1}$,
(2) For every function $S:[X]^{<\omega}\longrightarrow[X]^{<\omega}$ there exists a set $Y\in[X]^n$ such that $S(A)\cap Y\subset A$ for all $A\subset Y$.

In this context, the set Y obtained is said to be a free set. This combinatorial principle has some applications in the theory of nonseparable Banach spaces [2] concerning bases in spaces of integrable functions. For another application in Banach space theory, this time about extension operators, a similar principle was used in [1] in which X can be of cardinality $\aleph_1$, Y can be found of arbitrarily large finite cardinality, but the property does not hold for all but only for some subsets $A\subset Y$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let X be an uncountable set, m a natural number, and $S:[X]^{<\omega}\longrightarrow[X]^{<\omega}$ a function. Then, there exists $Y\subset X$ and a bijection $u:\{1,\dots,m\}\longrightarrow Y$ such that $Su(A)\cap Y\subset u(A)$ whenever A is of the form $A=\{k:i\leq k\leq j\}$ for some $i,j\in\{1,\dots,m\}$.*

This is not a complicated result, but it points in a different direction than most of the research that has been done in this topic of free sets for set-mappings, cf. for instance [3, 4, 5]. Instead of looking at the cardinality of the sets involved, we may look at the structure of the family of sets that freedom refers to.

Definition 1.3. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a finite family of finite sets. We define the natural number $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F})$ as the minimum $n<\omega$ such that for every function $S:[\aleph_n]^{<\omega}\longrightarrow[\aleph_n]^{<\omega}$ there exists $Y\subset\aleph_n$ and a bijection $u:\bigcup\mathcal{F}\longrightarrow Y$ such that $Su(A)\cap Y\subset u(A)$ for all $A\in\mathcal{F}$.*

First author supported by MINECO and FEDER (MTM2014-54182-P) and by Fundación Séneca - Región de Murcia (19275/PI/14). Second author supported by Fondation Sciences Mathématiques de Paris.

Theorem 1.1 implies that $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F})$ is a well defined natural number for every finite family $\mathcal{F}$ of finite sets. The two previous results can be now restated as:

(1) If $\mathcal{F}$ is the family of all subsets of $\{1,\dots,n\}$, then $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F}) = n-1$.
(2) If $\mathcal{F}$ is the family of all intervals of $\{1,\dots,n\}$, then $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F}) = 1$.

The general problem that we address in this paper is to compute $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F})$ for any family $\mathcal{F}$. We shall give some partial results when $\mathcal{F}$ is of certain specific forms. However, we are far from a satisfactory understanding of this function, and we are unable to compute it even in some specific simple cases. The following are open problems for us:

(1) Is $\mathfrak{ft}([X]^m) = m$ for every finite X and every natural number m with $m < |X|$? In the simplest case unknown to us, is $\mathfrak{ft}[\{1,2,3,4,5\}]^2 = 2$?

(2) Is $\mathfrak{ft}(12, 23, 34, 35, 56, 123, 235, 356, 2356) = 1$? (This is family of subsets of $\{1,2,3,4,5,6\}$ in simplified notation).

(3) Can we compute $\mathfrak{ft}$ with the recursive formula

$$\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F}) = 1 + \max_{A\subset X} \min_{a\in A} \mathfrak{ft}\{B\cap A\setminus\{a\} : a\in B\in\mathcal{F}\}\ ?$$

Proving the inequality $[\leq]$ would imply the equality, by results of Section 3.

2. Elementary properties of $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F})$

In the definition of $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F})$, we can restrict ourselves to only certain special functions S:

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a finite family of finite sets and $n \geq 1$. Suppose that for every function $S : [\aleph_n]^{<\omega} \longrightarrow [\aleph_n]^{<\omega}$ satisfying*

- *$S(A) \subset S(B)$ whenever $A \subset B$,*
- *$\alpha \notin S(A)$ whenever $\max(A) < \alpha \in \aleph_n$,*
- *$S(\{\alpha\}) = \emptyset$ for all $\alpha < \aleph_n$,*

there exists $Y \subset \aleph_n$ and a bijection $u : \bigcup\mathcal{F} \longrightarrow Y$ such that $Su(A)\cap Y \subset u(A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$. Then $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F}) \leq n$.

Proof. Let $S : [\aleph_n]^{<\omega} \longrightarrow [\aleph_n]^{<\omega}$ be an arbitrary function. By Fodor's pressing down lemma, there exists $\gamma_1 < \aleph_n$ and a stationary subset $Z_1 \subset \aleph_n$ such that $\max\{\gamma < \alpha : \gamma \in S(\{\alpha\})\} < \gamma_1$ for all $\alpha \in Z_1$. Let $Z_2 = \{\alpha \in Z_1 : \alpha > \gamma_1\}$. Define by induction an increasing function $f : Z_2 \longrightarrow Z_2$ such that $f(\alpha) > \max(S(B))$ whenever $B \in [Z_2]^{<\omega}$ and $\max(B) < \alpha$. Let Z_3 be the range of f. The new function $\tilde{S} : [Z_3]^{<\omega} \longrightarrow [Z_3]^{<\omega}$ defined by $\tilde{S}(A) = Z_3 \cap \bigcup_{B\subset A} S(B)$ satisfies the three conditions of the lemma (when we identify Z_3 with $\aleph_n$ via a monotone enumeration), so we get Y and u, that witness that $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F}) \leq n$ as in Definition 1.3. □

Lemma 2.2. *$\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F}) = 0$ if and only if for all $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$, either $A \subset B$ or $B \subset A$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F}) = 0$ and consider $S : [\aleph_0]^{<\omega} \longrightarrow [\aleph_0]^{<\omega}$ given by $S(A) = \{0, 1, \dots, \max(A)\}$. If we apply Definition 1.3, we get Y and u such that $Su(A) \cap Y \subset u(A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$. This implies that $u(A) \cap Y$ is an initial segment of Y for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$. Hence $\mathcal{F}$ is linearly ordered by inclusion. Conversely, suppose that $\mathcal{F}$ is linearly ordered by inclusion. In fact, we can suppose that $\mathcal{F} = \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{1,2\}, \dots, \{1,2,3,\dots\}\}$. Given $S : [\aleph_0]^{<\omega} \longrightarrow [\aleph_0]^{<\omega}$,

we can define u inductively, taking care that $u(k)$ is larger than the maximum of $\bigcup\{u(A) : \max(A) < k\}$. □

The index is monotone and it does not grow by adding intersections:

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ be two finite families of fine sets such that each element of $\mathcal{F}$ can be expressed as an intersection of elements of $\mathcal{F}'$. Then $\mathfrak{fr}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \mathfrak{fr}(\mathcal{F}')$.*

Proof. Let $n = \mathfrak{fr}(\mathcal{F}')$, and let $S : [\aleph_n]^{<\omega} \longrightarrow [\aleph_n]^{<\omega}$ be a function. Let $S_1 : [\aleph_n]^{<\omega} \longrightarrow [\aleph_n]^{<\omega}$ be given by $S_1(A) = \bigcup_{B\subset A} S(A)$. There exists $Y \subset \aleph_n$ and a bijection $u : \bigcup \mathcal{F}' \longrightarrow Y$ such that $S_1 u(A) \cap Y \subset u(A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{F}'$. Now, if $B \in \mathcal{F}$, it is of the form $B = A_1 \cap \cdots \cap A_m$ with $A_i \in \mathcal{F}'$ and

$$Su(B) \cap Y \subset S_1 u(A_i) \cap Y \subset u(A_i)$$

for every i, therefore $Su(B) \cap Y \subset \bigcap_i u(A_i) = u(B)$. □

It neither grows by taking restrictions.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of subsets of a finite set X. Consider $Y \subset X$ and $\mathcal{F}|_Y = \{A \cap Y : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Then $\mathfrak{fr}(\mathcal{F}|_Y) \leq \mathfrak{fr}(\mathcal{F})$.*

Proof. Let $n = \mathfrak{fr}(\mathcal{F})$. Fix $S : [\aleph_n]^{<\omega} \longrightarrow [\aleph_n]^{<\omega}$ as in Lemma 2.1. Then we have $u : X \longrightarrow \aleph_n$ satisfying $Su(A) \cap u(X) \subset u(A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$. But this implies that $Su(A \cap Y) \cap u(Y) \subset Su(A) \cap u(Y) \subset u(A) \cap u(Y) = u(A \cap Y)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$. □

Singletons and the total set are irrelevant:

Lemma 2.5. *If $\mathcal{F}$ is a family of subsets of X, then*

$$\mathfrak{fr}(\mathcal{F} \cup \{X\} \cup \{\{x\} : x \in X\}) = \max(1, \mathfrak{fr}(\mathcal{F})).$$

Proof. The fact that adding X to the family is meaningless follows directly from the definition. For the singletons, we use Lemma 2.1 and the fact that we can suppose that S satisfies $S(\{\alpha\}) = \emptyset$ for all α. □

3. Nested orders

There are certain families $\mathcal{F}$ that seem critical for this problem.

Definition 3.1. *Let X be a set and $\mathfrak{S}$ be a family of finite sequences of elements of X. We say that $\mathfrak{S}$ is a nested-orders family on X if the following hold:*

(1) $(t) \in \mathfrak{S}$ for all $t \in X$.
(2) If $(t_1, \dots, t_k) \in \mathfrak{S}$, then $t_i \neq t_j$ for all $i \neq j$.
(3) If $(t_1, \dots, t_k) \in \mathfrak{S}$, then $(t_1, \dots, t_{k-1}) \in \mathfrak{S}$ and $(t_1, \dots, t_{k-2}, t_k) \in \mathfrak{S}$.
(4) If $(t_1, \dots, t_k, s, t) \in \mathfrak{S}$ and $(t_1, \dots, t_k, t, u) \in \mathfrak{S}$, then $(t_1, \dots, t_k, s, u) \in \mathfrak{S}$.
(5) If $(t_1, \dots, t_k, t) \in \mathfrak{S}$, $(t_1, \dots, t_k, s) \in \mathfrak{S}$ and $t \neq s$, then eiher $(t_1, \dots, t_k, t, s) \in \mathfrak{S}$ or $(t_1, \dots, t_k, s, t) \in \mathfrak{S}$.

It will be convenient to consider also the restricted version of this definition:

Definition 3.2. *Let n be a natural number, let X be a set and $\mathfrak{S}$ be a family of finite sequences of length at most $n + 2$ of elements of X. We say that $\mathfrak{S}$ is an n-nested-orders family on X if the conditions (1), (2), (3) and (4) in Definition 3.1 hold, while condition (5) holds for $k < n$.*

For such a family $\mathfrak{S}$ as above and a natural number n, we consider the family of sets

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},n} = \{A \subset X : (t_1, \ldots, t_{n+1}, t_{n+2}) \in \mathfrak{S}, t_1, \ldots, t_n, t_{n+1} \in A \Rightarrow t_{n+2} \in A\}.$$

Observe that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},m} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},n}$ if $m < n$. The name of nested orders is because if we have $u = (t_1, \ldots, t_k) \in \mathfrak{S}$, then the relation given by $t \prec_u s$ if $(t_1, \ldots, t_k, s, t) \in \mathfrak{S}$ is a linear order on the set $\{t : (t_1, \ldots, t_k, t) \in \mathfrak{S}\}$, and this set is in turn the initial segment below t_k in the order relation $\prec_v$ determined by $v = (t_1, \ldots, t_{k-1})$. So $\mathfrak{S}$ comes from a family of linear order relations on nested initial segments. Conversely, a nested-orders family can always be constructed in the following way: Begin with a linear order on X and declare that $(t_1, t_2) \in \mathfrak{S}$ if and only if $t_1 > t_0$. Given the sequences of $\mathfrak{S}$ of lenght at most m, for every $t = (t_1, \ldots, t_{m-2}) \in \mathfrak{S}$, choose a linear order $\prec_t$ on $\{t : (t_1, \ldots, t_{m-2}, t) \in \mathfrak{S}\}$, and then declare that $(t_1, \ldots, t_m) \in \mathfrak{S}$ if and only if $t_m \prec_t t_{m-1}$. This argument is also useful for the following

Lemma 3.3. *For a natural number n and a family $\mathcal{F}$ of subsets of a set X, the following are equivalent:*

(1) There exists a nested-orders family $\mathfrak{S}$ such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},n}$.
(2) There exists a nested-orders family $\mathfrak{S}$ such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},m}$ for all $m \geq n$.
(3) There exists an n-nested-orders family $\mathfrak{S}$ such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},n}$.

Proof. $[2 \Rightarrow 1]$ is obvious. That $[1 \Rightarrow 2]$ follows from the observation that if $\mathfrak{S}$ is nested-orders, then $\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},n} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},n+1}$, which follows easily from the properties of the definition. That $[1 \Rightarrow 3]$ is clear because if $\mathfrak{S}$ is a nested-orders family, the sequences of $\mathfrak{S}$ of length at most $n+2$ form an n-nested-orders family. For the converse $[3 \Rightarrow 1]$, if $\mathfrak{S}$ is an n-nested-orders family, we can enlarge it to a nested-orders family, by adding sequences of larger length inductively, as described in the comments just before Lemma 3.3 □

There is a natural way to construct nested-orders families of sequences of length at most $n+1$ of ordinals below $\aleph_n$, and using that one can prove:

Theorem 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of subsets of a finite set X such that $\mathfrak{tr}(\mathcal{F}) \leq n$. Then there exists an n-nested-orders family $\mathfrak{S}$ such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},n}$.*

Proof. We are going to construct an n-nested-orders family $\mathfrak{S}_n$ of finite sequences of ordinals below $\aleph_n$ with the extra property that

$$|\{t < \aleph_n : (t_1, \ldots, t_k, t) \in \mathfrak{S}_n\}| < \aleph_{n+1-k}$$

for each $(t_1, \ldots, t_k)$ with $k \leq n+1$. In particular, $\{t < \aleph_n : (t_1, \ldots, t_{n+1}, t) \in \mathfrak{S}_n\}$ will be finite for any $t_1, \ldots, t_{n+1} < \aleph_n$, and we can define a function $S : [\aleph_n]^{<\omega} \longrightarrow [\aleph_n]^{<\omega}$ by

$$S(A) = \{t < \aleph_n : \exists t_1, \ldots, t_{n+1} \in A : (t_1, \ldots, t_{n+1}, t) \in \mathfrak{S}_n\}.$$

If $\mathfrak{tr}(\mathcal{F}) \leq n$ then we have the corresponding bijection $u : X \longrightarrow Y \subset \aleph_n$. The family $\mathfrak{S} = \{(t_1, \ldots, t_k) : (u(t_1), \ldots, u(t_k)) \in \mathfrak{S}_n\}$ would be the desired family of finite sequences. It remains to construct $\mathfrak{S}_n$. This is a standard recursive enumeration procedure. We declare, inductively on k, which sequences $(t_1, \ldots, t_k)$ belong to $\mathfrak{S}_n$. The empty sequence, and the one-element sequences (t_1) with $t_1 < \aleph_n$ they all belong to $\mathfrak{S}_n$. A sequence (t_1, t_2) belongs to $\mathfrak{S}_n$ if and only if $\aleph_n > t_1 > t_2$. Suppose that we already know which sequences $(t_1, \ldots, t_k)$ belong to $\mathfrak{S}_n$ and we

want to declare which sequences of lenght $k+1$ belong. We assume in the inductive hypothesis that

$$|\{t < \aleph_n : (t_1, \dots, t_{k-1}, t) \in \mathfrak{S}_n\}| < \aleph_{n+2-k}.$$

Then we can find an injection

$$\phi_{(t_1,\dots,t_{k-1})} : \{t < \aleph_n : (t_1, \dots, t_{k-1}, t) \in \mathfrak{S}_n\} \longrightarrow \aleph_{n+1-k}$$

and we can declare that $(t_1, \dots, t_k, t_{k+1}) \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ if and only if $(t_1, \dots, t_{k-1}, t_k) \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, $(t_1, \dots, t_{k-1}, t_{k+1}) \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ and $\phi_{(t_1,\dots,t_{k-1})}(t_k) > \phi_{(t_1,\dots,t_{k-1})}(t_{k+1})$. □

We can define a new index $\mathfrak{no}(\mathcal{F})$ as the least integer n such that there exists a nested-orders family $\mathfrak{S}$ of degree n such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},n}$.

Corollary 3.5. $\mathfrak{no}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F})$ *for every* $\mathcal{F}$.

But the following is an open problem for us:

Problem 3.6. *Is* $\mathfrak{no}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F})$ *for every* $\mathcal{F}$*?*

In other words, the question is whether $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},n}) \leq n$ for any finite nested-orders family $\mathfrak{S}$ of degree n. Along the rest of this section, X is a fixed finite set and $\mathcal{F}$ is a family of subsets of X.

Lemma 3.7. *For every integer* $k \leq |X| - \mathfrak{no}(\mathcal{F})$ *we have*

$$\left|\mathcal{F} \cap [X]^{\mathfrak{no}(\mathcal{F})+k}\right| \leq \binom{\mathfrak{no}(\mathcal{F})}{|X|-k}.$$

Proof. Let $n = \mathfrak{no}(\mathcal{F})$ and assume that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},n}$ for some nested-orders family of degree n. Let $A \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},n} \cap [X]^{n+k}$. By induction, pick $t_1, \dots, t_{n+1} \in A$ in such a way t_j is the $\prec_{(t_1,\dots,t_{j-1})}$-maximum of $A \setminus \{t_1, \dots, t_{j-1}\}$. At the end, since $A \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},n}$, we must have that

$$A = \{t_1, \dots, t_{n+1}\} \cup \{t \in X : t \prec_{(t_1,\dots,t_n)} t_{n+1}\}.$$

Thus, everything reduces to count how many sequences $(t_1, \dots, t_{n+1})$ are there such that $t_i \prec_{(t_1,\dots,t_{j-1})} t_j$ for all $i > j$ and such that $|\{t \in X : t \prec_{(t_1,\dots,t_n)} t_{n+1}\}| = k-1$. To each such sequence we can associate the numbers $m_i = |\{t \in X : t \preceq_{(t_1,\dots,t_{i-1})} t_i\}|$. These numbers satisfy $|X| \geq m_1 > m_2 > m_3 > \cdots > m_{n+1} = k$ □

Corollary 3.8. *For every integer* $k \leq |X| - \mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F})$ *we have*

$$\left|\mathcal{F} \cap [X]^{\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F})+k}\right| \leq \binom{\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F})}{|X|-k}.$$

Proof. Write $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathfrak{no}(\mathcal{F}) + i$ with $i \geq 0$. By Lemma 3.7,

$$\left|\mathcal{F} \cap [X]^{\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F})+k}\right| = \left|\mathcal{F} \cap [X]^{\mathfrak{no}(\mathcal{F})+i+k}\right|$$
$$\leq \binom{\mathfrak{no}(\mathcal{F})}{|X|-(k+i)} = \binom{\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F})-i}{|X|-k-i} \leq \binom{\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F})}{|X|-k}.$$

□

Lemma 3.9. *For every subset* $B \subset X$ *we have* $\mathfrak{no}(\mathcal{F}|_B) \leq \mathfrak{no}(\mathcal{F})$.

Proof. Suppose that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},n}$, and define $\mathfrak{S}^B = \{(t_1, \dots, t_k) \in \mathfrak{S} : t_1, \dots, t_k \in B\}$. It is easy to check that $\mathfrak{S}^B$ is a nested-orders family on B and $\mathcal{F}|_B \subset \mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S}^B,n}$ □

Lemma 3.10. *The following recursive formula for the computation of* $\mathfrak{no}$ *holds:*

$$\mathfrak{no}(\mathcal{F}) = 1 + \max_{A\subset X} \min_{a\in A} \mathfrak{no}\{B\cap A\setminus\{a\} : a\in B\in\mathcal{F}\}$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.9, for the inequality $[\geq]$, it is enough to check the general inequality

$$\mathfrak{no}(\mathcal{F}) > \min_{a\in X} \mathfrak{no}\{B\setminus\{a\} : a\in B\in\mathcal{F}\}.$$

So we suppose that $\mathcal{F}\subset\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},n}$ and we find $a\in X$ such that $\mathfrak{no}\{B\setminus\{a\} : a\in B\in\mathcal{F}\}\leq n-1$. Pick a the maximum of X in the order $\prec_\emptyset$ given by $t\prec_\emptyset s$ iff $(s,t)\in\mathfrak{S}$. If $a\in B\in\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},n}$, then $B\setminus\{a\}\in\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S}',n-1}$, where

$$\mathfrak{S}' = \{(t_1,\ldots,t_p) : (a,t_1,\ldots,t_p)\in\mathfrak{S}\}$$

is a nested-orders family. For the other inequality $[\leq]$ we call n to the right-hand side of the equation. We need to define a suitable nested-orders family $\mathfrak{S}$ such that $\mathcal{F}\subset\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},n}$. By Lemma 3.3, for every $A\subset X$ we can find $a[A]$ and a nested-orders family $\mathfrak{S}[A]$ such that

$$\{B\cap A\setminus\{a[A]\} : a[A]\in B\in\mathcal{F}\}\subset\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S}[A],n-1}.$$

Define $a_1 = a[X]$, $a_2 = a[X\setminus\{a_1\}]$, $a_3 = a[X\setminus\{a_1,a_2\}]$, etc, so that $X = \{a_1,a_2,\ldots,a_m\}$. Let $A_k = \{a_k,a_{k+1},\ldots,a_m\}$, so that $a_k = a[A_k]$. We define $\mathfrak{S}$ to be the family of all finite sequences of the form $(a_k,t_2,\ldots,t_p)$ such that $t_2,\ldots,t_p\in A_k\setminus\{a_k\}$ and $(t_2,\ldots,t_p)\in\mathfrak{S}[A_k]$. This is easily checked to be a nested-orders family on X. Now, we pick $B\in\mathcal{F}$ and we check that $B\in\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},n}$. So suppose that $(a_k,t_2,\ldots,t_{n+2})\in\mathfrak{S}$ and $a_k,t_2,\ldots,t_{n+1}\in B$. Then $a[A_k] = a_k\in B\in\mathcal{F}$, so $B\cap A_k\setminus\{a_k\}\in\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S}[A_k],n-1}$. Since $(t_2,\ldots,t_{n+1})\in B\cap A_k\setminus\{a_k\}$, we conclude that $t_{n+2}\in B\cap A_k\setminus\{a_k\}$, and in particular $t_{n+2}\in B$. This shows that $B\in\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},n}$. □

Lemma 3.11. $\mathfrak{no}(\mathcal{F}) = 0$ *if and only if* $\mathfrak{tr}(\mathcal{F}) = 0$ *if and only if* $\mathcal{F}$ *is linearly ordered by inclusion.*

Proof. Observe that a family of the form $\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},0}$ consists of the initial segments of the order $\prec_\emptyset$, so it is linearly ordered by inclusion. Using Lemma 2.2 and Corollary 3.5, we are done. □

Thus, Lemma 3.10 describes the index $\mathfrak{no}$ in a recursive way starting from the families linearly ordered by inclusion which are those of index 0. Using this, we easily compute the value of $\mathfrak{no}$ for the family $[X]^{<\omega}$ of all subsets of X:

Proposition 3.12. $\mathfrak{no}([X]^{<\omega}) = |X|-1$.

As a corollary of Lemma 3.10, and Lemma 3.11, Problem 3.6 is equivalent to Problem 3 in the introduction (indeed, by Corollary 3.5, equivalent to asking for the $[\leq]$ inequality).

4. Intersections of initial segments

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that we have* $n+1$ *many linear order relations* $<_1,<_2,\ldots,<_{n+1}$ *on a finite set* X*. Then the family*

$$\mathcal{F} = \{A\subset X : \exists s_1,\ldots,s_{n+1}\in X : A = \{t\in X : t\leq_1 s_1,\ldots,t\leq_{n+1} s_{n+1}\}\}$$

satisfies that $\mathfrak{tr}(\mathcal{F})\leq n$.

Proof. Let $S : [\aleph_n]^{<\omega}\longrightarrow[\aleph_n]^{<\omega}$ be a function. We shall define sets $A_{ix}\subset\aleph_n$ for $i\in\{0,1,\ldots,n+1\}$ and $x\in X$ with the following properties:

(1) $A_{0x} = \aleph_n$ for all x,
(2) $A_{1x} \cap A_{1x} = \emptyset$ if $x \neq y$,
(3) $A_{ix} \supset A_{jy}$ if $i < j$,
(4) $|A_{ix}| = \aleph_{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $A_{n+1,x}$ is a singleton $\{u(x)\}$ for all $x \in X$,
(5) $S(A_{ix}) \cap A_{iy} = \emptyset$ if $x <_i y$.

These sets are constructed by induction on i. Once i is fixed, if $X = \{x_1 <_i x_2 <_i \cdots <_i x_m\}$ one easily constructs each A_{ix_k} by induction on k, one just takes $A_{ix_k} \subset A_{i-1,x_k}$ such that $A_{ix_k} \cap \bigcup_{p<k} S(A_{i,x_p}) = \emptyset$, which is possible since $|A_{i-1,x_k}| = \aleph_{n-i+1} > |\bigcup_{p<k} S(A_{i,x_p})|$. The set $Y = u(X)$ and the bijection $u : X \longrightarrow Y$ are the ones that we are looking for, because (5) guarantees that if $A \subset X$ and $x <_i y$ for all $x \in A$, then $u(y) \notin S(u(A))$. □

Notice that Theorem 1.2 is a corollary of Theorem 4.1 obtained by taking $<_1$ the natural order of $\{1, \dots, m\}$ and $<_2$ the reverse order. We can also obtain Theorem 1.1:

Proposition 4.2. $\mathfrak{fr}([X]^{<\omega}) = |X| - 1$.

Proof. We consider linear orders $<_1, \dots, <_{n+1}$ on a set $X = \{s_1, \dots, s_{n+1}\}$ of cardinality $n+1$ such that the maximum of $<_k$ is s_k. In fact, any subset $A \subset X$ can be expressed as intersections of initial segments of the form $\{x : x \leq s_k\}$ if $s_k \in A$ or $\{x : x <_k s_k\}$ if $s_k \notin A$. This proves the inequality $[\leq]$. The other inequality follows from 3.12 and 3.5. □

5. Families of subsets of $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$

Lemma 5.1. *If $\mathcal{F}$ is a family of subsets of X which does not contain all subsets of X of cardinality $|X| - 1$, then $\mathfrak{fr}(\mathcal{F}) \leq |X| - 2$.*

Proof. Say that $X = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $\{1, \dots, n-1\} \notin \mathcal{F}$. For every $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ consider a linear order $<_k$ on X whose last two elements are $n <_k k$. All subsets of X except $\{1, \dots, n-1\}$ can be written as intersections of initial segments of these orders, so we can apply Lemma 4.1. In fact, if $n \in A \subseteq X$, then

$$A = \bigcap_{i \in A \setminus \{n\}} \{x \in X : x \leq_i i\} \cap \bigcap_{i \in \{1,\dots,n-1\} \setminus A} \{x \in X : x \leq_i n\}$$

while, if $n \notin A$, $A \neq \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, then

$$A = \bigcap_{i \in A} \{x \in X : x \leq_i i\} \cap \bigcap_{i \in \{1,\dots,n-1\} \setminus A} \{x \in X : x <_i n\}$$

□

If $\mathcal{F}$ is a family of subsets of X, we say that $\mathcal{F}$ contains a cycle if there exists a set $A = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \subset [X]$ of cardinality at least 3 such that

$$\{x_1, x_2\}, \{x_2, x_3\}, \dots, \{x_{k-1}, x_k\}, \{x_k, x_1\} \in \mathcal{F}|_A.$$

Lemma 5.2. *If $\mathcal{F}$ contains a cycle, then $\mathfrak{no}(\mathcal{F}) > 1$. Hence, also $\mathfrak{fr}(\mathcal{F}) > 1$.*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 3.7, because we can find no $a \in A$ such that $\mathfrak{no}\{B \cap A \setminus \{a\} : a \in B \in \mathcal{F}\} = 0$, that is, such that $\{B \cap A \setminus \{a\} : a \in B \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is linearly ordered by inclusion. □

Theorem 5.3. *If $\mathcal{F}$ is a family of subsets of $X = \{1,2,3,4\}$, then $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathfrak{no}(\mathcal{F})$. More precisely, supposing that $\mathcal{F}$ is closed under intersections,*

(1) $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathfrak{no}(\mathcal{F}) = 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{F}$ is linearly ordered by inclusion.
(2) $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathfrak{no}(\mathcal{F}) = 3$ if and only if $\mathcal{F} = [X]^{<\omega}$.
(3) $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathfrak{no}(\mathcal{F}) = 2$ if and only if $\mathcal{F} \neq [X]^{<\omega}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ contains a cycle.
(4) $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathfrak{no}(\mathcal{F}) = 1$ in the remaining cases.

Proof. Statement (2) follows from 3.11. The implication [$\Leftarrow$] of (1) follows from 4.2 and 3.12. The converse follows from Lemma 5.1, since we are assuming (for simplicity, based on Lemma 2.3) that $\mathcal{F}$ is closed under intersections, so if $\mathcal{F} \neq [X]^{<\omega}$ it must fail to contain a set of cardinality 3 (we assume $X \in \mathcal{F}$ as X is the result of intersecting an empty family). The implication [$\Leftarrow$] of (3) follows from (2) and Lemma 5.2. It only remains to show that if $\mathcal{F} \neq [X]^{<\omega}$, and $\mathcal{F}$ does not contain a cycle, then $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F}) \leq 1$. Let $\mathcal{F}^*$ be the elements of $\mathcal{F}$ of cardinality either 2 or 3. By Lemma 2.5, $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \max(\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F}^*), 1)$. If $\mathcal{F}$ contains three elements of cardinality 3, say $\{1,2,3\}$, $\{1,2,4\}$ and $\{1,3,4\}$, then $\mathcal{F}$ contains a cycle $\{2,3,4\}$. So $\mathcal{F}$ contains at most two sets of cardinality 3. We distinguish several cases. In the first case, we suppose that all doubletons of $\mathcal{F}$ have a common element, say 1. If there are two tripletons, their intersection is an element of $\mathcal{F}$, say $\{1,2\}$. So

$$\mathcal{F}^* \subset \{\{1,2\},\{1,3\},\{1,4\},\{1,2,3\},\{1,2,4\}\}.$$

Then, $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F}^*) \leq 1$ by application of Theorem 4.1 to the orders 1423 and 1324. If there are no two tripletons, the remaining possibility within the first case is that

$$\{2,3,4\} \in \mathcal{F}^* \subset \{\{1,2\},\{1,3\},\{1,4\},\{2,3,4\}\}.$$

But notice that if $\mathcal{F}$ has two of those doubletons, say $\{1,2\}$ and $\{1,3\}$, then we get a cycle $\{1,2,3\}$. So we may suppose $\mathcal{F}^* \subset \{\{1,2\},\{2,3,4\}\}$. Then $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F}^*) = 0$ since it is linearly ordered by inclusion. If the first case does not hold, and we cannot form a cycle with the doubletons, then we can suppose that the doubletons of $\mathcal{F}$ are contained in $\{\{1,2\},\{2,3\},\{3,4\}\}$. The second case is that all these three doubletons belong to $\mathcal{F}$. If we add $\{1,2,4\}$ or $\{1,3,4\}$ we would get cycles $\{2,3,4\}$ or $\{1,2,3\}$ respectively. So

$$\mathcal{F}^* \subset \{\{1,2\},\{2,3\},\{3,4\},\{1,2,3\},\{2,3,4\}\},$$

and we can apply Theorem 4.1 for the orders 1234 and 4321. The third case is that we get at most two doubletons. Since we already excluded case 1, those two doubletons are $\{1,2\}$ and $\{3,4\}$. Then, we can suppose that

$$\mathcal{F}^* \subset \{\{1,2\},\{3,4\},\{1,2,3\},\{1,2,4\}\}.$$

The two tripletons and $\{3,4\}$ induce a cycle $\{1,3,4\}$. So either

$$\mathcal{F}^* \subset \{\{1,2\},\{1,2,3\},\{1,2,4\}\}.$$

in which case we can use Theorem 4.1 for the orders 3124 and 4213, or there is only one tripleton, so we can suppose that

$$\mathcal{F}^* \subset \{\{1,2\},\{3,4\},\{1,2,3\}\},$$

and then we can use the orders 1234 and 4321. □

6. Familes $\mathcal{F}[\prec]$

If $\mathcal{F}$ is as in Theorem 4.1, according to Theorem 3.4 there must exist an n-nestd orders family $\mathfrak{S}$ such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},n}$ It is the following:

$$\mathfrak{S} = \{(t_1, \dots, t_p) : p \leq n+2 \text{ and } t_i <_k t_k \text{ whenever } k < i,\ k \leq n+1\}.$$

In fact, $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},n}$ because if $A = \{t \in X : t \leq_1 s_1, \dots, t \leq_{n+1} s_{n+1}\}$ and $(t_1, \dots, t_{n+2}) \in \mathfrak{S}$ and $t_1, \dots, t_{n+1} \in A$, then we have $t_{n+2} <_k t_k \leq_k s_k$, and therefore $t_{n+2} \leq_k s_k$ for all $k = 1, \dots, n+1$, and so $t_{n+2} \in A$.

We do not know if $\mathfrak{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S},n}) \leq n$ for such $\mathfrak{S}$. In what follows, we are going to discuss the simplest case when $n = 1$. For this, we introduce the following notation: If $X = \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $\prec$ is a linear order on $\{1, \dots, m-1\}$, then the above construction for the orders $<_1 = <$ (the usual order) and $<_2 = \prec$ gives:

$$\mathfrak{S}[\prec] = \{(t_1, \dots, t_p) : p \leq 3, t_1 > t_2, t_1 > t_3, t_2 \succ t_1\},$$
$$\mathcal{F}[\prec] = \mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{S}[\prec],1}.$$

For example, if $\prec$ coincides with the usual order $<$ of $\{1, \dots, m-1\}$, then

$$\mathcal{F}[<] = \{A \subset \{1, \dots, m\} : A = \{1, 2, \dots, k\} \cup \{p\} \text{ for some } 0 \leq k \leq p \leq m\}.$$

If $m > 4$, we cannot use Theorem 4.1 to show that $\mathfrak{tr}(\mathcal{F}[<]) \leq 1$. For suppose that there exist two linear orders $<_1$ and $<_2$ on $\{1, \dots, m\}$ such that every element of $\mathcal{F}[<]$ is the intersection of an initial segment of $<_1$ and an initial segment of $<_2$. Since $\{1, \dots, m-1\}$ and $\{1, \dots, m-2, m\}$ belong to $\mathcal{F}[<]$ they must be initial segments of each of the orders. So we can suppose that m is the $<_1$-maximum and $m-1$ is the $<_2$-maximum. But then, each set of the form $\{1, \dots, k\} \cup \{m\} \in \mathcal{F}[<]$ must be an initial segment of $<_2$, and each set of the form $\{1, \dots, k\} \cup \{m-1\}$ must be an initial segment of $<_1$. We conclude that

$$m <_2 1 <_2 2 <_2 3 <_2 \cdots <_2 m-1,$$
$$m-1 <_1 1 <_1 2 <_1 3 <_1 \cdots <_1 m-2 <_1 m.$$

But then $\{1, 3\} \in \mathcal{F}[<]$ is not the intersection of two initial segments.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $\prec$ be an order on the set $\{1, \dots, m-1\}$. Suppose that there exists $t \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$ such that*

$$t \prec t+1 \prec t+2 \prec t+3 \prec \cdots \prec m-1,$$
$$t \prec t-1 \prec t-2 \prec t-3 \prec \cdots \prec 1.$$

Then $\mathfrak{tr}(\mathcal{F}[\prec]) \leq 1$.

Proof. Let $S : [\omega_1]^{<\omega} \longrightarrow [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$ be a function as in Lemma 2.1. For two subsets $A, B \subset \omega_1$ we write $A < B$ if $\alpha < \beta$ for all $\alpha \in A$ an $\beta \in B$. First we fix countable subsets $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_t, A_{t+1} \subset \omega_1$ such that $A_1 < A_2 < \cdots < A_{t+1}$. We are going to define $u : \{1, \dots, m\} \longrightarrow \omega_1$ inductively with respect to the order $\prec$, defining $u(t)$ in the first place, and $u(m)$ in the last place (for convenience, we declare that $s \prec m$ for all $s < m$). Along with the construction we will also define, for each $s \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ two subsets $F_s, Z_s \subset \omega_1$ such that:

- F_s is finite and Z_s has cardinality ω_1,
- $F_r \subset F_s$ and $Z_r \supset Z_s$ whenever $r \prec s$,
- $A_{t+1} < Z_s$ for all s,
- $u(s) \in A_s \setminus F_s$ if $s \leq t$ and $u(s) = \min(Z_s)$ if $s > t$,

- $u(r) < u(s)$ if $r < s$ (this is a consequence of the previous).

Suppose that $u(r)$, F_t and Z_t are defined for all $r \prec s$, and we are going to define $u(s)$, F_s and Z_s. Let $B_s = \{u(r) : r \prec s\}$, let $F_s^- = \bigcup_{r \prec s} F_r$ and let $Z_s^- = \bigcap_{r \prec s} Z_r$. In the initial step when $s = t$, we take $B_t = F_t^- = \emptyset$ and $Z_t^- = \{\alpha < \omega_1 : \alpha > \sup(A_{t+1})\}$. By the Δ-system lemma, we can find a subset $Z' \subset Z_s^-$ of cardinality ω_1 such that

$$\{S(B_s \cup \{\alpha\}) : \alpha \in Z'\}$$

is a Δ-system of root R_s. Notice that $R_s \supset S(B_s)$. Let $T_\alpha^s = S(B_s \cup \{\alpha\}) \setminus R_s$ be the tails of the Δ-system. We can find a further uncountable subset $Z_s \subset Z'$ such that

$$(\star) \quad R_s \cup \{\min(Z_s^-)\} < T_\alpha^s \cup \{\alpha\} < T_\beta^s \cup \{\beta\} \quad \text{for all } \alpha, \beta \in Z_s \text{ with } \alpha < \beta.$$

Let $F_s = F_s^- \cup R_s$. As for the choice of $u(s)$, if $s > t$ then $u(s)$ is taken as the minimum of Z_s, and if $s \leq t$, then we pick $u(s) \in A_s \setminus F_s$. This finishes the definition of u. It remains to prove that this u satisfies the requirement that $Su(A) \cap Y \subset u(A)$ when $A \in \mathcal{F}[\prec]$ and $Y = \{u(1), \ldots, u(m)\}$. So, suppose that we have $A \in \mathcal{F}[\prec]$ and that $s \notin A$ and we prove that $u(s) \notin Su(A)$. We consider two critical elements of A, $c = \max(A)$ and $a = \min(A \setminus \{c\})$, the minimum and maximum refer to usual order $<$. If A is a singleton, we take $a = c$. We distinguish several cases:

Case 1 $c < s$. This implies that $u(s) \notin Su(A)$ simply because we are assuming that S is as in Lemma 2.1.

Case 2: $s < c$ and $c > t$. Since $A \in \mathcal{F}[\prec]$, we must have $A \setminus \{c\} \subset \{r : r \prec s\}$. So if $B_s = \{u(r) : r \prec s\}$ as in the inductive definition of $u(s)$, then we would have $Su(A) \subset S(B_s \cup \{u(c)\})$. So it is enough to check that $u(s) \notin S(B \cup \{u(c)\})$.

- If $s > t$, then $u(s) \in Z_s$ and since $t < s < c$, $u(c) \in Z_c \subset Z_s$. By $(\star)$ above, for $\alpha = u(s) \in Z_s$ and $\beta = u(c) \in Z_s$, we have $\alpha \notin R_s \cup T_\beta^s = S(B_s \cup \{\beta\})$, which is what we wanted to prove.
- If $s \leq t$ and $s \prec c$, then $u(s) \in A_s < \min(Z_s^-)$, so using $(\star)$ again for $\beta = u(c)$, we obtain that $u(s) \notin T_\beta^s \cup \{\beta\}$. Since $u(s) \in A_s \setminus F_s$, also $u(s) \notin R_s$. Therefore $u(s) \notin R_s \cup T_\beta^s = S(B_s \cup \{\beta\})$.
- If $s \leq t$ and $c \prec s$, then $B_s \cup \{u(c)\} = B_s$, and we know that $u(s) \notin F_s \supset B_s$.

Case 3: $s < c \leq t$. Since $A \in \mathcal{F}[\prec]$ and $t \prec t - 1 \prec \cdots$, this implies that $A = \{a, a+1, \ldots, c\}$ and $s < a$. Remember that $F_s \supset R_s \supset S(B_s)$. In this case $u(A) \subset B_s$, so $Su(A) \subset S(B_s) \subset F_s$. Since $u(s) \in A_s \setminus F_s$, we get that $u(s) \notin Su(A)$.

□

Corollary 6.2.

$$\mathfrak{fr}\left(\{A \subset \{1, \ldots, m\} : A = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\} \cup \{p\} \text{ for some } 0 \leq k \leq p \leq m\}\right) = 1.$$

Proof. As observed before Theorem 6.1, the above family coincides with $\mathcal{F}[<]$ when $<$ is the usual order of $\{1, \ldots, m-1\}$, which satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 6.1 for $t = 1$. □

Consider the family

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}[5 \prec 3 \prec 2 \prec 4 \prec 1] =$$
$$\{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{4\}, \{5\}, \{6\}, \{1,2\}, \{2,3\}, \{3,4\}, \{3,5\}, \{5,6\},$$
$$\{1,2,3\}, \{2,3,5\}, \{3,5,6\}, \{2,3,5,6\}, \{1,2,3,4,5,6\}\}.$$

This is a family that does not satisfy the hypothesis of Theorem 6.1, and for which there are essential difficulties to follow any similar argument. So we do not know if $\mathfrak{ft}(\mathcal{F}) = 1$. This is Problem 2 in the introduction.

References

[1] A. Avilés and W. Marciszewski, *Extension operators on balls and on spaces of finite sets*, Studia Math. 227 (2015), no. 2, 165–182.

[2] P. Enflo, H. P. Rosenthal, *Some results concerning $L^p(\mu)$-spaces*, J. Funct. Anal. 14 (1973), 325–348.

[3] P. Erdős, A. Hajnal, *On the structure of set-mappings*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar 9 (1958) 111–131.

[4] A. Hajnal, A. Máté, *Set mappings, partitions, and chromatic numbers*, Logic Colloquium '73 (Bristol, 1973), pp. 347–379. Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, Vol. 80, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1975.

[5] P. Komjáth, S. Shelah, *Two consistency results on set mappings*, J. Symbolic Logic 65 (2000), no. 1, 333–338.

[6] K. Kuratowski, *Sur une caractérisation des alephs*, Fund. Math. 38 (1951), 14–17.

Universidad de Murcia, Departamento de Matemáticas, Campus de Espinardo 30100 Murcia, Spain.

E-mail address: avileslo@um.es

Universidad de los Andes, Departamento de Matemáaticas 1117111 Bogotá, Colombia.

E-mail address: c.pina@uniandes.edu.co